



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/714,730 | 11/17/2003 | King-Hwa Lee | OIC0078US | 4654 |
| 60975 | 7590 | 11/01/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP 11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE BLDG. H, SUITE 250 AUSTIN, TX 78758 | | | TANK, ANDREW L | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2173 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 11/01/2007 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/714,730 | LEE ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Andrew Tank | 2173 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 August 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment of August 9, 2007. Claims 1, 5-8, 10-11, 19-20, 22, 24-25, and 29-31 have been directly amended. Claims 1-31 are pending and have been considered below.

Specification

2. Applicant acknowledgement, dated August 9, 2007, of the Examiner's suggestion, dated February 6, 2007, to include a Summary of the Invention section in the Specification.

37 CFR 1.73 states:

A brief summary of the invention indicating its nature and substance, which may include a statement of the object of the invention, should precede the detailed description. Such summary should, when set forth, be commensurate with the invention as claimed and any object recited should be that of the invention as claimed.

The Examiner acknowledges that the "Summary of the Invention" section is not required, only suggested. As such, the examiner withdraws the previous Specification objection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The amendments to claims 6, 10 and 30, dated August 9, 2007, have overcome the enablement requirement rejection of February 6, 2007. These rejections are withdrawn.
4. The amendment to claim 22, dated August 9, 2007, has overcome the antecedent basis rejection of February 6, 2007. This rejection is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. **Claims 20 and 22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bookman et al., (US 5,761,673), hereafter known as Bookman.

Claim 20: Bookman discloses a computer-readable medium containing a data structure defining an inbound command to a web server (col 3 lines 61-62: “Web server environment, containing conventional objects”), the data structure comprising:

an execute element having a path attribute indicating a location of an object manager (col 4 lines 1-2: “Web server executable”);

a command element nested within the execute element and having a value attribute indicating a name of a command to execute (col 4 lines 2-3: “Web browser makes an object request from Web server executable”), wherein the command element represents a predefined query (col 4 lines 5-6: “a table in database, based on the object request URL”); and

one or more argument elements nested within the command element, each argument element having a name attribute indicating a name of an argument for the named command (col 3 lines 64-65: “each object has an attribute associated with it”), the one or more argument elements being from a set of argument elements comprising an argument element for indicating a response markup format (col 4 line 7: “an HTML file”), an argument element for indicating whether the response should include user interface elements (col 4 line 7: “an HTML file”), and an arguments element identifying a transform to be applied to output (col 4 lines 9-12: “CGI script”).

Claim 22: Bookman discloses a computer-readable medium as in claim 20 above, and further disclose that zero or more occurrences of the command elements are nested within the execute element. Bookman discloses that a command element is nested within the execute element, therefore, the command elements, when they do occur (one), are nested within the execute element and, when they do not occur (zero), occur nowhere (col 3 lines 61-67, col 4 lines 1-12).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-19 and 25-31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over London et al. (US 5,831,609), hereafter known as London, in view of Hallberg et al., “Using Microsoft Excel 97”, published by Que Corporation, copyright 1997 Que Corporation, hereafter known as “Hallberg”.

Claim 1: London discloses a method comprising:

providing information relating to a business application (col 2 lines 60-63: “host computer executes application programs”) in a server system (col 3 lines 31-32: “the host computer is connected to the X-Terminals”), comprising:

receiving a request (col 3 lines 31-49 “network”), wherein

the request is configured to cause the business application to execute a command of the business application (col 5 lines 6-7: “when the API command is window management related”),

the request comprises an indication of a user interface element to be returned (col 4 lines 55-67),

executing the command of the business application to generate a data element (col 6 lines 27 “character string Hello”);

generating the user interface element to be returned in response to the request (col 6 lines 17-18 “ShowWindow API”); and

sending a response comprising user interface element and the data element (col 5 lines 65-67, col 6 line 1).

While London does not specifically disclose that the command is a predefined query,

London does disclose the use of “MICROSOFT EXCEL” (col 2 line 62).

Hallberg discloses that Microsoft Excel is a spreadsheet program with database functionality (page 383: “Building Excel Databases”). This functionality includes the ability to selectively filter list results, i.e. query the database to return results based on a predefined filter (page 394: “AutoFilter”). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art and the teachings of London and Hallberg before them at the time the present invention was made, to use the business application Microsoft Excel, complete with the database functionality and querying, in the business application interface server system disclosed by London. One would have been motivated to allow a user to use Microsoft Excel,

in particular the database functionality of Excel, in order to better manage data, as suggested by Hallberg (page 383: “organizing your data”).

Claim 8: London discloses a method in a server system for providing application information, the method comprising:

providing transforms for transforming output of the business application, each transform having a name (col 7 lines 16-30);
receiving from a client system a request to execute a command of an application (col 4 lines 48-53), the request optionally indicating the name of a transform to be applied to the output of the application (col 7 lines 16-30);
executing the command of the application to generate output (col 5 lines 22-31);
when the request indicates the name of a transform,
applying the provided transform with the indicated name to the generated output to generate transformed output (col 7 lines 10-30); and
when the request does not indicate the name of a transform, sending to the client system the generated output (col 7 lines 10-30).

While London does not specifically disclose that the command is a predefined query, London does disclose the use of “MICROSOFT EXCEL” (col 2 line 62). Hallberg discloses that Microsoft Excel is a spreadsheet program with database functionality (page 383: “Building Excel Databases”). This functionality includes the ability to selectively filter list results, i.e. query the database to return results based on a predefined filter (page 394: “AutoFilter”). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art and the teachings of London and Hallberg before them at the time the present invention was made, to use the business application

Microsoft Excel, complete with the database functionality and querying, in the business application interface server system disclosed by London. One would have been motivated to allow a user to use Microsoft Excel, in particular the database functionality of Excel, in order to better manage data, as suggested by Hallberg (page 383: “organizing your data”).

Claim 25: London discloses a method in a server system for providing application information, the method comprising:

receiving a request (col 3 lines 31-49 “network”) to execute a command of a business application (col 4 lines 48-53), wherein
the request is received from a client system (col 5 lines 65-67, col 6 line 1),
the request indicates a user interface element (col 4 lines 53-67) and a data element (col 6 lines 21-22: “requests the painting of the text Hello on the screen”) to be returned as results of execution of the command;
executing the command of the application to generate the data element (col 6 line 27: “character string Hello”);
when the request indicates to return at least one user interface element (col 5 lines 53-56), generating the at least one user interface element to be returned; and
sending to the client system a response that comprises the generated user interface element and the generated data element (col 5 lines 65-67, col 6 line 1); and
when the request indicates to not return at least one user interface element col 5 lines 48-52),
sending to the client system a response comprising the generated data element without user interface element (col 5 lines 65-67, col 6 line 1).

While London does not specifically disclose that the command is a predefined query, London does disclose the use of “MICROSOFT EXCEL” (col 2 line 62). Hallberg discloses that Microsoft Excel is a spreadsheet program with database functionality (page 383: “Building Excel Databases”). This functionality includes the ability to selectively filter list results, i.e. query the database to return results based on a predefined filter (page 394: “AutoFilter”). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art and the teachings of London and Hallberg before them at the time the present invention was made, to use the business application Microsoft Excel, complete with the database functionality and querying, in the business application interface server system disclosed by London. One would have been motivated to allow a user to use Microsoft Excel, in particular the database functionality of Excel, in order to better manage data, as suggested by Hallberg (page 383: “organizing your data”).

Claims 11 and 12: London discloses a method in a server system for providing information relating to a business application, the method comprising:

providing a default format for output of the business application (col 6 lines 63-65);
receiving from a client system a request to execute a command of a business application (col 4 lines 48-53), the request optionally indicating a user agent format or a client-specified format for the output of the business application (col 6 lines 56-58);
executing the command of the business application to generate output (col 5 lines 22-31);
and
sending to the client system the generated output in the selected format (col 5 lines 22-31).

While London does not specifically disclose that the command is a predefined query, London does disclose the use of "MICROSOFT EXCEL" (col 2 line 62). Hallberg discloses that Microsoft Excel is a spreadsheet program with database functionality (page 383: "Building Excel Databases"). This functionality includes the ability to selectively filter list results, i.e. query the database to return results based on a predefined filter (page 394: "AutoFilter"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art and the teachings of London and Hallberg before them at the time the present invention was made, to use the business application Microsoft Excel, complete with the database functionality and querying, in the business application interface server system disclosed by London. One would have been motivated to allow a user to use Microsoft Excel, in particular the database functionality of Excel, in order to better manage data, as suggested by Hallberg (page 383: "organizing your data").

London and Hallberg do not specifically disclose selecting a format giving preference in the following order: the client-specified format, the user-agent format, and the default format. However, London does disclose the use of a default window (col 6 lines 62-63) and the use of a handle identifying the window the application program wishes to display (lines 53-59). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made that a default window that is then modified to some inputs gathered from the client would display the modified windows first, the default windows if no modifications are present. It can be further gathered that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made would deem it obvious that a certain set of client inputs could also be gathered from the user, thereby setting up some sort of user-based window selection. One would

be motivated to allow user and client specified displays to display over the default in order to provide the user with more accurate information.

Claims 2 and 26: London and Hallberg disclose the remote business application server system method as in claims 1 and 26 above respectively, and London further discloses wherein the request indicates a type of user interface element to return (col 4 lines 5-6).

Claims 3 and 27: London and Hallberg disclose the remote business application server system method as in claims 1 and 26 above respectively, but do not specifically disclose that the request indicates a type of user interface element to not return. However, London does disclose the request indicating a type of user interface element to return (col 4 lines 5-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made that if one could return types of elements, one could also not return those elements. One would have been motivated to not return these elements in order to provide the server system with only specific elements, thereby limiting the amount of processes required and raising the efficiency of the processor.

Claims 4 and 28: London and Hallberg disclose the remote business application server system method as in claims 3 and 27 above respectively, but do not specifically disclose that the type of user interface element to not return is navigation data. However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made would know that user interface elements of typical applications include menu bars, toolbars, backgrounds, colors, forms, shapes, navigational information, etc. Therefore, it would have been obvious one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to not return one of these elements. One would have been motivated to not return these elements in order to provide the server system with only specific

elements, thereby limiting the amount of processes required and raising the efficiency of the processor.

Claims 5 and 29: London and Hallberg disclose the remote business application server system method as in claims 1 and 25 above respectively, and London further discloses wherein the request comprises an “SWEDataOnly” argument, that is, when this argument is TRUE only data elements are returned and when this argument is FALSE both data and user interface elements are returned (col 5 lines 40-60).

Claims 6 and 30: London and Hallberg disclose the remote business application server system method as in claims 1 and 25 above respectively, and London further discloses wherein the request includes a “SWEExclude” argument (col 5 lines 40-60).

Claims 7 and 31: London and Hallberg disclose the remote business application server system method as in claims 1 and 25 above respectively, and Hallberg further discloses the ability of Microsoft Excel to selectively filter database information using predefined queries (page 394). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art and the teachings of London and Hallberg before them at the time the present invention was made, to receive a predefined query, as taught by Hallberg, in the business application method of London and Hallberg. One would have been motivated in order to provide a user with information pertinent to them, as suggested by Hallberg (page 394 paragraph 1).

Claim 9: London and Hallberg disclose the remote business application server system method as in claim 8 above, but do not specifically disclose that the generated output is in XML format and the provided transforms are XSLT stylesheets. However, London does disclose the use of the X-Protocol to generate an output. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention

was made would know to that what is written one programming language can also be written in another programming language such as C, C++, HTML, JavaScript, X-Protocol, XML, WML, etc. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to generate the output in XML format, and to specify the presentation of a class of XML documents using XSLT stylesheets. One would have been motivated to do this in order to have a result more compatible with web-based applications.

Claim 10: London and Hallberg disclose the remote business application server system method as in claim 8 above, and London further discloses wherein the request includes a "SWEXslStyleSheet" argument (col 5 lines 40-60):

Claim 13: London and Hallberg disclose the remote business application server system method as in claim 11 above, and London further discloses the user-agent format being based on a type of user agent specified in the request (col 2 lines 60-64).

Claim 14: London and Hallberg disclose the remote business application server system method as in claim 13 above, but do not specifically disclose that the type of user agent specified is a type of browser. However, London discloses the host application that the user wishes to use being "MICROSOFT EXCEL" or "WORD FOR WINDOWS" (col 2 lines 60-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made that London's list of host applications could be expanded to include programs such as "MICROSOFT POWERPOINT" or "MICROSOFT INTERNET EXPLORER", the later being a web browser. One would be motivated to include these in order to provide the remote user with more options for applications to run in their native GUI system.

Claims 15-18: London and Hallberg disclose the remote business application server system method as in claim 11 above, but do not specifically disclose the formats being a markup language. However, London does disclose the use of the X-Protocol to generate an output (col 5 line 25-26). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made would know that what is written one programming language can also be written in another programming language such as C, C++, HTML, JavaScript, X-Protocol, XML, WML, etc. One would have been motivated to use a markup language in order to have a result more compatible with web-based applications.

Claim 19: London and Hallberg disclose the remote business application server system method as in claim 11 above, but do not specifically disclose the request including a “SWESetMarkup” argument that specifies the client-specified format as being XML, HTML, or WML. However, London does disclose the use of the X-Protocol to generate an output (col 5 line 25-26) as well disclosing the host application that the client wishes to use being “MICROSOFT EXCEL” or “WORD FOR WINDOWS” (col 2 lines 60-64). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made would realize that London’s list of host applications could be expanded to include programs such as “MICROSOFT POWERPOINT” or “MICROSOFT INTERNET EXPLORER”, the later being a web browser. In the case of “MICROSOFT INTERNET EXPLORER” being the application the client wishes to use, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention that the original programming could be written in a more web-friendly language such as HTML, XML, WML, or JavaScript. One would be motivated to do this in order to provide the client system with more

selection in applications to use, as well as providing a result that is more compatible in the case of web-based applications.

8. **Claims 21 and 23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bookman.

Claim 21: Bookman discloses the computer-readable medium as in claim 20 above, but do not specifically disclose that the data structure is an XML document. However, Bookman do disclose the use of object requests from Web server executables (col 4 lines 2-3) and the use of HTML (col 4 lines 45-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made that the data structure to be used in a Web based situation could also be written in XML, WML, HTML, JavaScript, CGI Script, etc. One would be motivated to write it in XML in order to benefit from a more database oriented programming language.

Claim 23: Bookman discloses the computer-readable medium as in claim 20 above, but do not specifically disclose that only one command element is nested within the execute element. However, Bookman do disclose a command element nested within the execute element (col 3 lines 61-67, col 4 lines 1-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to include only one command element within the execute element. One would have been motivated to only include one command element when only one command element was needed, in order to save processing time and increase the efficiency and speed with which the processor operates.

9. **Claim 24** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bookman in view of Hallberg.

Claim 24: Bookman discloses a computer-readable medium containing a data structure defining an outbound response sent by a web server (col 3 lines 61-62: “Web server environment, containing conventional objects”, col 4 lines 12-13: “back to requesting Web browser”), the data structure comprising:

an application element (col 1 lines 56-57: “CGI is a standard interface for running external programs on a Web server.”, col 3 lines 62-63: “an object”) having a name attribute (col 3 lines 65-66: “each object has an attribute associated with it that identifies the type of object”);
a navigation element nested within the application element, having a name attribute (col 4 lines 6: “based on the object request URL”).

However, Bookman do not specifically disclose that the navigation element has sub-elements from a set comprising a menu element, tool bar element, screen bar element, thread bar element, view bar element, and page item element. Bookman do disclose “Web browsers” (col 1 lines 36-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made that “Web browsers” include: menus, tool bars, screen bars, view bars, etc. One would have been motivated to disclose the navigation element having these standard browser sub-elements in order to allow the user greater flexibility in the browser they chose to use.

Also, Bookman do not specifically disclose one or more elements from the set of elements including a screen element, an applet element, and a form element, the one or more elements

being nested within the application element and each having a name attribute. However, Bookman do disclose Web browsers requesting particular hypermedia documents (col 1 lines 45-67, col 2 lines 1-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to allow applet scripts, forms, and URL queries to be nested within the web browser. One would have been motivated to do this in order to provide dynamic hypermedia to an end-user, thereby increasing the user interactivity.

Bookman does not specifically disclose a predefined query bar element nested within the application element. Hallberg discloses that Microsoft Excel is a spreadsheet program with database functionality (page 383: “Building Excel Databases”). This functionality includes the ability to selectively filter list results, i.e. query the database to return results based on a predefined filter, used in bars (page 394: “AutoFilter”, Fig. 14.9). Further, Hallberg discloses that Microsoft Excel files can be opened using a web browser (page 638: “The file will open within Internet Explorer, and you can edit it just as if you had opened it in Excel directly.”) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art and the teachings of Bookman and Hallberg before them at the time the present invention was made, to use the business application Microsoft Excel, complete with the database functionality and predetermined query bars, in the business application interface server system disclosed by Bookman. One would have been motivated to allow a user to use Microsoft Excel while in a web browser, in particular the database functionality of Excel, in order to better manage data, as suggested by Hallberg (page 383: “organizing your data”).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 8, 11, 20, and 24-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant amended the above claims with additional limitations in order to traverse the presented prior art rejections. New art has been introduced to meet these new limitations.

11. Applicant's arguments filed August 9, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues, on pages 10-11, that Microsoft Excel is not a database program, and as such, cannot support a command that is a predefined query. However, as presented by the newly introduced prior art of Hallberg, Microsoft Excel can be used as a database program, complete with predefined querying functions.

Applicant argues, on page 12, that, “Bookman fails to show, teach or even suggest the use of a command that is a predefined query, **among other of the claim limitations Bookman fails to show, teach, or suggest.**” (Emphasis supplied). The first argument is drawn to newly amended limitations and is moot in view of the new ground of rejection. The second argument is not persuasive as the examiner maintains that claim 24 is unpatentable in view of Bookman, as disclosed by the rejection above.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Further, Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Tank whose telephone number is 571-270-1692. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri (Alt. Fri Off) 0730-1500 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on 571-272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ALT

ALT

October 18, 2007

TADESSE HAILU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

